DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 064 CS 507 135

AUTHOR Roiger, James F.; Hellweg, Susan A.
TITLE Influence and Compliance-gaining Strategies in Interpersonal Settings and Control and Influence Strategies in Organizational Settings: A Synthesis of the Literature.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, February 15-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Communication Skills; Compliance (Psychology); *Interpersonal Communication; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Communication; Organizational Objectives; *Organizational Theories; Social Control; *Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Strategies; Management Practices; Message Transmission; Organizational Culture; Supervisor Subordinate Relationship

ABSTRACT

This research review integrates the major concerns of the research on power and compliance-gaining strategies and influence strategies in interpersonal and organizational relationships. The review: (1) identifies theories of social power; (2) identifies limited models of social influence; (3) delineates various conceptualizations of interpersonal compliance-gaining strategies; (4) summarizes the studies that have attempted to link influence and compliance-gaining strategies in interpersonal settings; (5) looks at recent studies on organizational power and control; (6) summarizes recent studies that have investigated control and influence strategies in organizations, including several that integrate interpersonal conceptualizations in the studies; (7) identifies some commonalities in the studies of the two settings; and (8) discusses implications for future research in both settings. Three tables of data are included; 49 references are attached. (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318064

Influence and Compliance-gaining Strategies in Interpersonal Settings and Control and Influence Strategies in Organizational Settings: A Synthesis of the Literature

James F. Roiger

and

Susan A. Hellweg

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SUSAN A. HELLWEG

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

San Diego State University

Speech Communication Department

San Diego, California 92182-0300

Paper presented at the

Western Speech Communication Association Convention

Tucson, Arizona

February 1986

Running Head: Organizational Control

CS507135

ABSTRACT

An increasing number of studies are appearing in the communication literature that deal with influence strategies and compliance-gaining. Little effort has been thus far evidenced to tie what is being found in the interpersonal and in the organizational literature about these constructs, specifically in terms of strategies utilized by sources, situational factors, etc. Insomuch as interpersonal relationships do exist in organizations, this paper makes an attempt to integrate these two contextual lines of inquiry as well as the two constucts involved and point to potentially constructive areas for future research in the organizational and the interpersonal context.

Influence and Compliance-gaining Strategies in Interpersonal Settings and Control and Influence Strategies in Organizational Settings: A Synthesis of the Literature

Introduction

A number of communication scholars have bemoaned the lack of a theoretical framework in organizational communication research (e.g., Dennis, Goldhaber, & Yates, 1978; Jablin, 1978; Redding, 1979; Richetto, 1977). The study of power and control in organizations, as well, has been a fragmented and segmented pursuit at best. Tompkins and Cheney (1985a) argued that power is most often treated only as a variable in the organizational setting instead of the overarching factor in determining the regularities of organizational behavior (p. 180). Barnard (1938) identified power as a legitimate concern in the study and understanding of organizations. However, in recent years, studies have been conducted and theoretical notions developed that link aspects of power and compliance-gaining, both in the interpersonal literature and in the organizational literature (e.g., Bullis, 1984; Hudson, 1985; Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983, 1985; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985a, 1985b, 1985c; Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart, 1983; Wheeless, Hudson, & Wheeless, 1985). This paper will review the literature on influence and compliance-gaining strategies in the interpersonal literature and control and

influence strategies in the organizational literature, with the goal of determining some commonalities in the two areas and projecting the fusion of these two lines of inquiry where appropriate.

More specifically, this paper will (a) identify theories of social power, (b) identify limited models of social influence, (c) delineate various conceptualizations of interpersonal compliance-gaining strategies, (d) summarize the studies that have attempted to link influence and compliance-gaining strategies in interpersonal settings, (e) review recent studies on organizational power and control, (f) summarize recent studies that have investigated control and influence strategies in organizations including several that integrate interpersonal conceptualizations in the studies, (g) identify some commonalities in the studies of the two settings, and (h) discuss implications for future research in both settings. The review of the literature is not intended to be exhaustive, but to document the major concerns of the research on power and compliance-gaining strategies and influence strategies in interpersonal and organizational relationships.

The terminology in the literature is confusing at best. The following definitions are specified, for clarity's sake, in this paper. Tompkins & Cheney (1985a) and King (1975) viewed power as the capacity or ability, or the potential, to achieve a goal. In the interpersonal literature, influence is the exercising of the potential to achieve a goal. In the organizational setting,

control is the exercising of the capacity or ability to achieve a goal. In the interpersonal setting, a compliance-gaining strategy attempts to influence a goal. In the organizational setting, an influence strategy attempts to control a goal.

Conceptualizations of Social Power Theories

The concept of social power has been developed and explained by several different theories, e.g., field theory, exchange theory, decision theory, and role theory, but there are some dimensions that all theories seem to have in common. Henderson (1981) identified four common dimensions of power theories: (1) dependence, (2) intentionality, (3) equity, and (4) role structure. Henderson (1981) posited that general theories of social power "are more complex, structured conceptualizations of social power designed to be more encompassing" (p. 73) than are the models of social power. Each of these theories include some or all of the dimensions identified by Henderson (1981).

The first of these dimensions, dependence, or interdependence, requires an interaction and is best explained by Jones and Gerard's (1967) proposed model of interaction contingencies. The first contingency is a pseudocontingency because each participant's response is determined by his or her own action, not by reaction to the agent's action. The second contingency is an asymmetrical contingency because the agent is powerful and the target is weak. The target's responses are

completely dependent on the influencing agent. The third contingency is a reactive contingency where the actions of the agent and the target are dependent on the preceding action of the other. The final contingency is a mutual contingency in which each participant's actions are partly the result of the other's actions (Henderson, 1981, pp. 13-14).

The second dimension is intentionality and may be planned or unplanned. Dahl (1957) specified that the agent acts deliberately to produce changes in the target, while other scholars (e.g., King, 1975) argued that the unplanned actions of the agent may produce changes in the target (Henderson, 1981, pp. 15-17).

Equity, the third dimension, is concerned with the notion that the outcomes received by all parties be in some way equal to the inputs (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978).

Role structure is is the final dimension and is based on the idea of Thibaut and Kelley (1959) that roles are a cluster of norms that help to define a relationship and provide for the separation of task and maintenance functions.

Conceptualizations of Limited Models of Social Power

Limited models of power are more salient because they are "restricted in scope and focus on different features of relationships involving power" (Henderson, 1981, p. 23). We will consider three limited models of power that are in use at

the present time.

French (1955) and French and Raven (1959) proposed a five-category typology of power that an agent might use: reward, coercive, expert, referent, and legitimate power. Deutsch and Gerard (1959) identified power as social influence and identified two types of social influence, informational and normative. King (1975) expanded on the work of Deutsch and Gerard dividing informational social influence and normative social influence into two categories, outcome control and cue control. Kelman (1961) identified power as means control by an agent who utilizes the traits of attractiveness and credibility. Means control may be actuated through compliance, identification, or internalization.

Limited models of power attempt to explain influences based on the potential of power. In recent years, power and influence have become concerns in the study of compliance-gaining strategies in the interpersonal setting.

Compliance-gaining Literature in Interpersonal Relationships

Research on compliance-gaining strategies has generally followed two approaches. The first approach has involved deductive methods in the examination of compliance-gaining behaviors. Such research has used a predetermined list of strategies and the respondents have been asked to choose which strategies they would use in a given compliance-gaining

situation. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) conducted the first such study and provided a 16-category list of tactics. A factor analysis of the results indicated five dimensions: (1) rewarding activity, (2) punishing activity, (3) expertise, (4) activation of impersonal commitments, and (5) activation of personal commitments. Most of the researchers using a deductive approach in further investigations of compliance-gaining strategies have continued to use Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) taxonomy (e.g., Baxter, 1984; Lustig & King, 1980; Roloff & Barnicott, 1978).

A second approach to the study of compliance-gaining has involved inductive methods requiring respondents to develop their own compliance-gaining strategies in response to a given situation. Studies falling into this category include Clark (1979), Delia, Kline and Burleson (1979), and O'keefe and Delia (1979). Compliance-gaining investigations incorporating inductive approaches have by their nature necessitated more complicated methodologies and in particular have required verbal facility on the part of the respondents.

In a comparison of the two appproaches, Clark (1979), Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981), and Schenck-Hamlin, Georgacarakos and Wiseman (1982) have argued that there are significant differences between the two approaches and the results that the approaches provide, but Chmielewski (1980) and Boster, Stiff and Reynolds (1985) have reported that both approaches provide similar results.

Interpersonal Influence and Compliance-gaining Strategies

Wheeless, Barraclough and Stewart (1983) argued that the use of influence in interpersonal situations determines the compliance-gaining strategies that an individual might use. They identified three categories of interpersonal influence that may be used in compliance-gaining. Wheeless et al. (1983) classified French and Raven's (1959) typology of the types of influence and Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) categories of compliance-gaining strategies to their three categories of interpersonal influence. The results of this classification appear in Table 1.

The first category of interpersonal influence Wheeless et al. (1983) identified was that of expectancies/consequences to which French and Raven's (1959) categories of reward and coercive influence and Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) compliance-gaining categories of rewarding and punishing activities are assigned.

The second Wheeless et al. (1983) category of interpersonal influence was relationships/identifications that included French and Raven's (1959) categories of expert and referent influence and Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) compliance-gaining categories of expertise and activation of personal commitments. The third category of interpersonal influence was values/obligations that included French and Raven's (1959) category of legitimate influence and Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) category of activation of impersonal commitments.

Table 1 about here

Wheeless et al. (1983) have provided the most comprehensive effort to link, at least theoretically, the effects of influence on compliance-gaining strategies. Two studies have attempted empirically to link influence and compliance-gaining. Clark (1979) examined the impact of self-interest on strategy selection, and Baxter (1984) investigated the use of politeness as a influence strategy that effects the selection of compliance-gaining strategies using a taxonomy based on Brown and Levinson's (1978) theory of politeness.

Organizational Control Conceptualizations

The study of power and control in organizations has been a concern of researchers for many years. Kipnis (1976) argued that the exercise of control in organizational relationships is an important area of inquiry. Farace, Monge, and Russell (1977) posited that "power exists only in relationships" (p. 164) and "All people in an organization enter into relationships with other people; they are interdependent in terms of power" (p. 164).

Browning (1978), utilizing a grounded theory approach,

examined the concept of power. Through a series of critical incidents, interviews, and observations of employees in a regional public land use and transportation planning agency, he uncovered three control clusters: legitimacy, approval and disapproval, and expertise and information. Browning (1978) argued that "The organization is a power setting where interpersonal influence is a primary attribute" (p. 102). Influence strategy categories isolated using cluster analysis included personal advancement strategies, coalition formation, and expectations.

Eisenberg (1984) proposed a model of organizational control that he identified as stategic ambiguity. He argued that there is an overemphasis on openness and clarity in organizational research because openness and clarity are non-normative, and that the stategic use of ambigious messages may help a communicator attain certain organizational goals. Eisenberg (1984) envisioned a continuum with unambigious messages at one end and highly ambigious messages at the other end. He claimed three advantages for the use of ambiguity: (1) it promotes unified diversity, (2) it facilitates organizational change, and (3) it amplifies existing source attributions and preserves privileged positions.

Jensen (1984) synthesized interpersonal compliance-gaining strategies and organizational influence strategies and critiqued the review from the perspective of the coordinated management of meaning theory (Pearce, 1976; Cronen, Pearce & Harris, 1982). He proposed a model of logical force as an attempt to understand the

process of influence strategies and compliance-gaining.

Tompkins and Cheney (1985a) provided useful definitions of three key concepts. They defined the noun power "as an ability or capacity to achieve some goal even against the resistance of others" (p. 180). They defined the verb control "as the exercise or act of achieving a goal" (pp. 180). Finally, they defined organizational power as "the ability or capacity of a person or persons to control the contributions of others toward a goal" (p. 180). They agreed with Edwards (1981) that organizational power is nebulous and is vested in the corporate entity, which maintains control over its members by the use of three processes; (1) direction of work tasks, (2) evaluation of work done, and (3) the rewarding and disciplining of the workers (p. 181).

Edwards (1981) identified three types of organizational control: (1) simple control that is exercised openly, (2) technical control that is based on physical technology, and (3) bureaucratic control that is based on the organization's social organization (p. 161). Tompkins and Cheney (1985a) added a fourth type of organizational control called concertive control that is based on stressing teamwork and coordination (p. 183).

Tompkins and Cheney (1985a) defined the notion of unobtrusive control as consisting of a composite of Edward's (1981) types of control, bureaucratic control, and their type of control, concertive control. Unobtrusive control is defined as controlling the behavior of workers by controlling their decisions (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985a, p. 183). Unobtrusive

organizational control is seen as the metaphor of the enthymeme that is defined as a "Syllogistic decision-making process, individual or collective, in which a conclusion is drawn from premises (beliefs, values, expectations) inculcated in the decision maker(s) by the controlling members of the organization" (p. 188).

According to Tompkins and Cheney (1985a), the controlling members of the organization use organizational identification as the primary method to limit or control behavior. They argue that the identification process will work because an individual's goals will match the organization's goals, or the individual's goals will coincide with the organization's goals. They also indicate that the identification process may be detrimental to the organization if the individual indentified with only a subset of the organizations goals or identified with extra-organizational goals. Tompkins and Cheney (1985a) posit that "The perception of significant authority, along with the necessary sacrifice of autonomy and the appeal of specific incentives serve as compelling reasons for individual cooperation and acceptance of organizational premises as controlling his/her decisions" (p. 187). Unobtrusive control is viewed as a communication double interact. Downward control is distinguished by the directing, monitoring, and rewarding/punishing activities that are manifested in the superior-subordinate relationship. Upward control functions as subordinates, who act individually, then seek consensus or a collective decision to support the act.

Tompkins & Cheney (1985a) posited that unobtrusive control may provide the basis for a communication-centered theory of organizations.

In a qualitative field study of the U. S. Forest Service that used Tompkins and Cheney's conceptualization of communication as unobtrusive control, Bullis (1985) found that there were three prominent types of communication--information dissemination, discussion, and decision making--that occurred in regular meetings. The information dissemination communication acted to establish the premises of the organization identification process. The discussion communication established the notion that the premises were not just in the interests of the organization, but also in the interests of the individual members. Finally, the decision-making communication was then guided by the controlling members of the organization to develop a consensus decision that the goals of the organization were also the goals of the individual members. Although the supervisors could not identify these three types of communication specifically, the supervisors answers to a questionnaire supported the concepts isolated in the observation part of the study. Bullis (1985) contended that her study provided support for Tompkins and Cheney's conceptualization of communication as unobtrusive control.

Cushman and Cahn (1985) posited that the supervisor-subordinate relationship is an interpersonal relationship that is based on role-taking and self-validation processes. They argued

that "Supervisors and subordinates form interpersonal relationships based on each person's comparison of his or her own self-conception with that indicated by the other" (p. 103). They identified three distinct types of supervisor-subordinate communication: (1) task communication that focuses on maintaining and enhancing production, (2) socio-emotional communication that focuses on creating and maintaining esprit de corps which results in high task efficiency and retention of personnel, and (3) innovative communication that focuses on changes in production (p. 103).

Cushman and Cahn (1985) argued that organizational communication and supervisor-subordinate communication are interdependent because the organization's communication is based on one or more of the three types of supervisor-subordinate communication. The type of communication used will determine the type of control that is used in the organization. A task communication oriented organization relies on rewarding-punishing control. A socio-emotional oriented organization uses the identification process similar to Tompkins and Cheney's (1985a) notion of unobtrusive control. An innovatively oriented organization uses teams of people who are free to structure their relationship as they please in order to permit creative ideas to emerge. They Hasten to add that some organizations use more than one of the orientations.

They finally argued that an organization that is aware of its particular orientation will be better able to effectively

screen job applicants and will be able to select for employment those applicants who respond more effectively to that orientation.

Dalton and Lawrence (1971) posited that organizations have to exercise control in order to achieve goals. They identified two problems that always plague organizational control, compliance and resistance. Compliance becomes a problem when "people follow the prescribed behavior even when it becomes inappropriate" (p. 8). Resistance is a problem because "each individual is involved in an attempt to try to gain control over the major elements in his environment" (p. 9). To alleviate or to prevent these problems, Dalton and Lawrence (1971) argued that organizations subscribe to the notion of reciprocity of control. Reciprocity of control is an idea that was first advanced by Homans (1961) as social exchange theory. The individual in the organization relinquishes some individual control over his/her environment in exchange for anticipated rewards that the organization will provide. The organization relinguishes some control of tasks so that the individual retains control over the achievement, and sometimes the amount or type, of the rewards.

Reciprocity of control is proposed to solve compliance problems because inappropriate behavior reduces production and thereby reduces rewards. It also proposes to solve resistance problems because the anticipated rewards offer the individual an alternative type of control, not over the environment but over the rewards. Although rewards have been specifically addressed,

sanctions, or punishing activities, may also be used to establish the reciprocity of control.

Dalton and Lawrence (1971) identified three types of control: (1) organizational controls that establish and meet production requirements, (2) social controls that are derived from the mutual commitments of members of the group to each other and the shared ideals of the members, and (3) self-control by which individuals establish objectives and work to accomplish them. While not expressly addressing the communication aspects of these types of control, Dalton and Lawrence (1971) posited that these types of control are negotiated through an interactive process between the management and the workers.

Even though the notions advanced by the communication scholars who are studying power, control, and influence strategies in organizations may contain the dimensions of power theories that were identified by Henderson (1981), these notions are rightly labeled as models because of their limited focus, i.e., the organizational setting and the concern with control and influence strategies.

Influence Strategies in Organizations

Kipnis and Schmidt (1983) identified control as interpersonal tactical actions, or influence attempts. These influence attempts occur, either implicitly or explicitly, in the process of negotiation. Control is exercised to satisfy personal

objectives, to prevent interference with one's activity, and most often, to pursue organizational objectives. In an earlier study, Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) found that managers use influence attempts that differ from those that individuals use in interpersonal compliance-gaining in non-organizational settings, although later Kipnis studies (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985) argued that similarities do exist.

In the 1980 study, Kipnis et al. conducted two experiments to establish categories of influence attempts. The first experiment, using an inductive method, identified five reasons for exercising control: (1) to obtain assistance on one's own job, (2) to get others to do their jobs, (3) to obtain personal benefits, (4) to initiate change in work, and (5) to improve target's job performance. They identified 14 categories of influence strategies: clandestine, personal negative actions, administrative negative actions, exchange, persistance, training, reward, self-presentation, direct request, weak ask, demand, explained rationale for request, gathered supporting data, and coalitions.

Their findings suggested that:

> In organizational settings the choice of influence tactics is associated with what the respondents are trying to get from the target person, the amount of resistance shown, and the power of the target person. Combining these findings suggests that administrative sanctions and personal negative actions are more likely to be used when the target is a

> subordinate who is actively resisting the request of the manager and when the reasons for exercising influence are based on the respondent's role in the organization (e.g., improve target's performance). (p. 443)

The second experiment used the same five reasons for exercising control, but the use of factor analysis reduced the number of influence tactic categories to eight: assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality, sanctions, exchange, upward appeal, blocking, and coalitions. This study utilized a deductive methodology developed as a result of the first study. The experiment also separated the status of the target into three categories: superior, co-worker, and subordinate. The differences in the choice of tactics compared to target status indicated that the respondents may have different reasons for influencing target persons at different status levels. Four of the categories were used at all status levels: assertiveness, sanctions, ingratiation, and rationality. Three of the categories were used when influencing superiors: exchange of benefits, blocking, and upward appeal. Coalitions were used when attempting to influence subordinates.

Synthesizing the results of the two studies, Kipnis and Schmidt (1983) concluded:

> Managers will use <u>assertiveness</u> when they have a predominance of power, their objectives are organizational (rather than personal), and their expectations about their ability to influence the target are low. Managers will use

> reason when the target and the manager approach equality in power, organizational objectives are sought, and they have expectations about their abilities to exercise influence. Finally, ingratiation is most likely to be used when managers have less power than the target of influence, personal objectives are sought, and expectations of successful influence are low. (p. 312)

Wheeless, Hudson, and Wheeless (1985) studied the relationship between managerial style and influence strategy styles. Influence strategy style was operationalized as either intimidating, ingratiating, or formal. These three styles of influence strategies were equated to the Wheeless et al.'s (1983) three-factor typology of influence used in interpersonal compliance-gaining strategies, expectancies/consequences, relationships/identifications, and values/obligations. This study is one of the first that has argued explicitly for the similarity of organizational influence strategies and control, and interpersonal compliance-gaining and influence. Utilizing the Kipnis et al. (1980) questionnaire, reduced somewhat to meet current requirements (deleted blocking tactics), Wheeless et al. (1985) found that the ingratiation style was similar to Kipnis et al.'s ingratiaton and exchange categories, intimidating style was similar to the assertiveness and sanctions categories, and the formal style was similar to the rationality category. Using the Richmond and McCroskey management communication style scale of tells (low, boss-centered), sells, consults, and joins (high,

employee-centered), Wheeless et al. (1985) found that as the communicaton style scores decreased, the scores on the intimidation strategy increased. This was the only significant relationship. One of the reasons they offered for the low correlation was the low statistical power of the study.

Hudson (1985) studied the effect of supervisor influence strategies on organizational outcomes utilizing job satisfaction, subordinate trust of supervisor, and organizational commitment as the criterion variables. The study utilized the influence strategy styles identified by Wheeless et al. (1985). The results indicated that there are significant relationships between influence strategy style and the criterion variables but "did not point to a compliance-gaining style that would create more job satisfaction, trust of supervisor, and organizational commitment" (p. 12).

In a 1985 study that attempted a direct comparison of the compliance-gaining strategies of couples in an interpersonal setting and influence strategies of managers in an organizational setting, Kipnis and Schmidt found that strategies of both couples and managers were categorized by hard, soft, and rational tactics. Hard tactics were used when the influencer had the advantage, resistance was anticipated, and the target's behavior violated social or organizational norms. Soft tactics were used when the influencer was at a disadvantage, resistance was anticipated, and the goal was to get benefits for one's self. Rational tactics were used when neither party had a real power

advantage, resistance was not anticipated and the goal was to get benefits for one's self and one's organization (p. 42). Although the earlier Kipnis et al. (1980) study claimed a lack of similarities, this study with direct comparisons did determine similar results. Kipnis (1984), in an analysis of the original Marwell and Schmitt (1967) work on compliance-gaining and his own research, found that three categories matched very well, rewards (soft tactics), punishment (hard tactics), and logic (rational tactics).

Synthesis of Organizational and Interpersonal Constructs

The Wheeless et al. (1983) typology of interpersonal influence provides a unifying structure for categorizing limited models of influence (social power) and proposed models of organizational control. Table 2 provides a synopsis of the Wheeless et al. typology and the limited models of influence. The typologies of the sources of influence identified by the limited models of social power may be categorized into the Wheeless et al. (1983) typology as follows: The category of expectancies/consequences (Wheeless et al. 1983) includes Deutsch and Gerard's (1955) normative influence, King's (1975) outcome control normative influence, French and Raven's (1959) rewarding and coercing influence, and Kelman's (1961) compliance forcing influence. The second category is relationships/identifications (Wheeless et al., 1983) and includes Deutsch and Gerard's (1955)

normative influence, King's (1975) cue control normative influence, French and Raven's (1959) expert and reference influence, and Kelman's (1961) identification influence. The third category is values/obligations (Wheeless et al., 1983) and includes French and Raven's (1959) legitimate influence and Kelman's (1961) internalization influence. A fourth category, not identified by Wheeless et al. (1983), is information power and includes Deutsch and Gerard's (1955) informational influence, and King's (1975) informational influence. This last category is dropped from consideration because both Deutsch and Gerard (1955) and King (1975) use the term to define unintentional, or unknown, control. The effect of informational influence has not been studied empirically.

Table 2 about here

The concept of organizational control may also be categorized by the Wheeless et al. (1983) typology with a few minor exceptions that will be noted. Table 3 provides a synopsis of the Wheeless et al. typology and the limited models of organizational control. The category of expectations/ consequences includes Browning's (1978) approval/disapproval, Tompkins and Cheney's (1985a) rewards/disciplining, Cushman and Cahn's (1985) task functions, and Dalton and Lawrence's (1971)

production requirements. The category of relationships/ identification includes Browning's expertise, Tompkins and Cheney's (1985a) evaluation of work, Cushman and Kahn's (1985) socio-emotional, and Dalton and Lawrence's social control. The category of values/obligations includes Browning's (1978) legitimacy, Tompkins and Cheney's (1985a) direction of tasks, and Dalton and Lawrence's (1971) self-control. Browning (1978) identified a fourth category he called information control, and Cushman and Kahn (1985) identified innovative control. Neither of these fit comfortably into the other three categories.

Although there is not universal agreement on the correlation between interpersonal compliance-gaining strategies and organizational influence strategies, Wheeless et al. (1985) presented a viable argument for such a correlation. Kipnis and Schmidt (1983, 1985) found some correlation in their more recent studies that included a direct comparison of interpersonal settings and organizational settings. The following categories are identified and assigned to the three categories of interpersonal influence proposed by Wheeless et al. (1983). The influence category of expectancies/consequences includes Kipnis and Schmidt's (1983) assertiveness, Kipnis and Schmidt's (1985) hard tactics, and Wheeless et al.'s (1985) intimidating compliance-gaining strategies. The influence category of relationships/identification includes Kipnis and Schmidt's (1983) ingratiation, Kipnis and Schmidt's (1985) soft tactics, and Wheeless et al.'s (1985) ingratiating compliance-gaining

strategies. The influence category of values/obligations includes Kipnis and Schmidt's (1983) reason, Kipnis and Schmidt's (1985) rationality, and Wheeless et al.'s (1985) formal compliance-gaining strategies.

Table 3 about here

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

The review of influence and compliance-gaining stategies in the interpersonal setting and control and influence strategies in the organizational setting reveals that there is a similarity in the concepts that guide the research that has been conducted in the two settings.

From this review, a number of areas for future research can be advocated. First, given that interpersonal relationships do exist within the organization, the applicability of the general interpersonal literature findings with regard to influence and compliance-gaining need to be specifically tested. This paper suggests that some applicability is possible but this needs empirical verification and the limits of such grounding need defining. A multivariate method of confirmatory factor analysis may begin to provide empirical verification. Kipnis and Schmidt (1985) have made an initial testing in this regard. Further

inquiry will allow perhaps for greater understanding of organizational relationships.

In the interpersonal literature, compliance-gaining has been studied in terms of symmetrical relationships (Wheeless et al., 1983). Inherent within organizational contexts is the asymmetricality of formally defined supervisor-subordinate relationships. It might be argued that interpersonal relationships, at least on an informal level, are comprised to some degree of asymmetricality. In organizations, one would suspect that horizontal relationships among co-workers would involve some degree of informal asymmetricality. The comparative implications of this formal versus informal asymmetricality suggests a second intriging area of inquiry.

Hudson (1985) examined the effects of influence strategies upon three organizational outcomes, employee satisfaction, trust, and commitment. The interpersonal literature dealing with compliance-gaining is conspiciuously absent of studies dealing with relational outcomes. It may be fruitful, as a third area of inquiry, to examine the consequences of compliance-gaining upon relational satisfaction, trust, and commitment, as well as other outcome variables.

The concept of strategic ambiguity has recently emerged in the organizational literature (Eisenberg, 1984). As a concept involving the intentional use of ambiguity among organizational members to achieve goals, it would appear to be relevant to the power and compliance-gaining literature, particularly in terms of

its goal orientation and manipulative element. As information, or the lack of it, may be linked to control relationships in organizations, it may also be an important consideration in interpersonal relationships. This concept as it relates to compliance-gaining and influence offers a fourth advocated area of inquiry. Ambiguity in the interpersonal literature has been examined from a receiver's perspective. Strategic ambiguity as an organizational phenomenon is examined by Eisenberg from the perspective of the source involved.

Table 1

Classification of Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) categories of compliance-gaining strategies and French and Raven's (1959) categories of the sources of influence using Wheeless,et al.'s (1983) typology of interpersonal influence.

Wheeless et al. Typology of Interpersonal Influence	Marwell & Schmitt Categories of Compliance-gaining Strategies	French & Raven Categories of Influence Sources
Expectancies and Consequences	Rewarding activity	Reward influence
	Punishing activity	Coercive influence
Relationships and Identifications	Expertise	Expert influence
	Activation of personal commitments	Referent influence
Values and Obligations	Activation of impersonal commitments	Legitimate influence

Table 2

Classification of limited models of influence according to Wheeless et al.'s (1983) typology of interpersonal influence.

Wheeless et al. (1983)	Deutsch & Gerard (1955)	French & Raven (1959)	Kelman (1961)	King (1975)
Expectancies and Consequences	Normative influence	Reward influence Coercive influence	Compliance forcing	Normative influence (outcome control)
Relationships and Identification	Normative influence	Expert influence Referent influence	Identication	Normative influence (cue control)
Values and Obligations		Legitimate influence	Internalization	
-----	Informational			Informational

Table 3

Classification of organizational control strategies according to Wheeless et al.'s typology of interpersonal influence.

Wheeless et al. (1983)	Browning (1978)	Cushman & Cahn (1985)	Dalton & Lawrence (1971)	Kipnis & Schmidt (1983)	Tompkins & Cheney (1985a)
Expectations and Consequences	Approval Disapproval	Task functions	Production requirements	Assertiveness Sanctions	Rewards Discipline
Relationships and Identifications	Expertise	Socio-emotional	Social control	Ingratiation Exchange	Evaluation of work
Values and Obligations	Legitimacy		Self-control	Reason	Direction of tasks
-----	Information Innovative				

Table 3 (continued)

Classification of organizational control strategies according to Wheeless et al.'s typology of interpersonal influence.

Wheeless et al. (1983)	Kipnis & Schmidt (1985)	Wheeless et al. (1985)
Expectations and Consequences	Hard tactics	Intimidation
Relationships and Identifications	Soft tactics	Ingratiation
Values and Obligations	Rationality	Formal

References

Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baxter, L. A. (1984). An investigation of compliance-gaining as politeness. Human Communication Research, 10, 427-456.

Boster, F. J., Stiff, J. B., & Reynolds, R. A. (1985). Do persons respond differently to inductively-derived and deductively-derived lists of compliance gaining message strategies? A reply to Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 49, 177-187.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction (pp. 56-289). Cambridge, Eng: University Press.

Browning, L. D. (1978). A grounded communication theory derived from qualitative data. Communication Monographs, 45, 93-109.

Bullis, C. (1985, February). Communication as unobtrusive control: A field study. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Fresno, CA.

Chmielewski, T. L. (1980, April). A cognitive model of the strategy selection process. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association convention, Ocean City, MD.

Clark, R. A. (1979). The impact of self-interest and desired liking on selection of persuasive strategies. Communication Monographs, 46, 257-273.

Cronen, V. E., Pearce, W. B., & Harris, L. (1979). The

coordinated management of meaning: A theory of communication. In F. E. X. Dance (Ed.), Human communication theory: Comparative essays (pp. 61-89). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cushman, D. P., & Cahn, D. D., Jr. (1985). Communication in interpersonal relationships. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 2, 201-218.

Dalton, G. W., & Lawrence, P. R. (1971). Motivation and control in organizations. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.

Delia, J. C., Kline, S. L., & Burleson, B. R. (1979). The development of persuasive communication strategies in kindergarteners through twelfth-graders. Communication Monographs, 46, 241-256.

Dennis, H. S., Goldhaber, G. M., & Yates, M. P. (1978). Organizational communication theory and research: An overview of research methods. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 2 (pp. 243-269). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 629-636.

Edwards, R. C. (1981). The social relations of production at the point of production. In M. Zey-Ferrell and M. Aiken (Eds.), Complex organizations: Critical perspectives (pp. 161-178).

Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. Communication Monographs, 51, 227-242.

Farace, R. V., Monge, P. R., & Russell, H. M. (1977). Communicating and organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

French, J. R. P., Jr. (1965). A formal theory of social power. Psychological Review, 63, 181-193.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The basis of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Henderson, A. H. (1981). Social power: Social psychological models and theories. New York: Praeger.

Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Hudson, D. C. (1985, May). An investigation of the relationships of compliance-gaining styles and organizational outcomes in superior/subordinate dyads. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Honolulu, HI.

Jablin, F. M. (1973, November). Past, present and future research priorities in organizational communication. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Minneapolis, MN.

Jensen, A. I. (1984, May). Compliance-gaining and resisting between supervisors and subordinates: A review of the literature and alternative theoretical approach. Paper

presented at the International Communication Association convention, San Francisco, CA.

Jones, E. E., & Gerard, H. B. (1967). Foundations of social psychology. New York: Wiley.

Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. Public Opinion Quarterly, 25, 57-78.

King, S. W. (1975). Communication and social influence. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kipnis, D. (1976). The powerholders. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kipnis, D. (1984). The use of power in organizations and in interpersonal settings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), Applied social pyschology annual: Vol. 5. Applications in organizational settings (pp. 179-210). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1983). An influence prespective on bargaining within organizations. In M. H. Bazerman and R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), Negotiating in organizations (pp. 303-319). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1985, April). The language of persuasion. Psychology Today, pp. 40-46.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 440-452.

Lustig, M. W., & King, S. W. (1980). The effect of communication apprehension and situation on communication strategy choices. Human Communication Research, 7, 74-82.

Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. Sociometry, 30, 350-364.

O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. (1979). Construct comprehensiveness and cognitive complexity as predictors of the number and strategic adaption of arguments and appeals in a persuasive message. Communication Monographs, 46, 231-240.

Pearce, W. B. (1976). The coordinated management of meaning: A rules based theory of interpersonal communication. In G. R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication (pp. 17-36). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Redding, W. C. (1979). Organizational communication theory and ideology: An overview. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3 (pp. 309-341). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Richetto, G. M. (1977). Organizational communication theory and research: An overview. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1 (pp. 331-346). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Roloff, M. E., & Barnicott, E. F. (1978). The situational use of pro- and anti-social compliance-gaining strategies by high and low machiavellians. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 2 (pp. 193-205). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Schenck-Hamlin, W. J., Georgacarakos, G. N., & Wiseman, R. L. (1982). A formal account of interpersonal compliance-gaining.

Communication Quarterly, 30, 173-180.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1985a). Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions (pp. 179-210). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1985b, May). A theory of control in contemporary organizations. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Honolulu, HI.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1985c, May). Implications for power and alienation in organizational communication research. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Honolulu, HI.

Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). Equity: Theory and research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wheeless, L. R., Barraclough, R., & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in research. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 7 (pp. 105-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wheeless, L. R., Hudson, D. C., & Wheeless, V. E. (1985, February). An examination of the relationships among management communication style, compliance-gaining styles, and organizational outcomes. Paper presented at the Western Speech

Communication Association convention, Fresno, CA.

Wiseman, R. L., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. (1981). A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively-derived set of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Monographs, 48, 251-270.